

REMARKS

In the above-mentioned office action, all of the pending claims, claims 1-20, were rejected. Claims 1-4, 7, 8, and 10-19 were rejected under Section 102 over De Beer. Claims 1, 5, 6, 15, and 20 were rejected under Section 102 over Lannen. Claims 1, 9, and 15 were also rejected under Section 102 over Bergenwall. Additionally, claims 5 and 13 were rejected under Section 112, second paragraph for recitations that lack antecedent bases. And, objection was made to claims 11 and 18 for informalities cited therein.

The undersigned acknowledges the Examiner's efforts to identify the portions of the cited references that were relied upon in the rejections of the claims.

In response to the claim rejections, the independent claims have been amended, as set forth herein, in matters believed better to distinguish the present application over the cited references, taken alone, or in any combination.

Support the amendments is found in the specification, for instance, on page 5, lines 9-13, page 10, lines 26-30, and page 10, lines 20-23.

With respect to exemplary claim 1, the claim has been amended, now to recite that the radio communication system has first and second networks permitting of mobile-node communications. And, the recitation of the routing determiner has been amended, now to recite that the determiner determines routing by which the data is to be communicated pursuant to the mobile-node communications by way of any of the first and second networks, free of additional registration. Method claim 15 has been analogously amended. Amendments made to various of the dependent claims were made responsive to amendments made to their respective parent claims.

None of the references are believed to disclose the subject matter recited in claims 1 and 15, as now-amended. That is to say, none of the references provides routing information relating to a plurality of networks without requiring multiple registrations.

De Beer describes call set up procedures and registration of a mobile telephone, but the reference fails to disclose the mobile telephone being provided with routing information by way

of separate networks responsive to a single registration. Multiple registrations would be required.

Paragraph 33 of De Beer identifies a routing table 13. And, this paragraph further indicates that routing information is exchanged during call set up procedures. And, while paragraph 35 indicates that, when it is turned-on, the mobile telephone registers with a local network, there is no disclosure of the mobile station provided with determined routings usable to communicate by way of more than one network. The claims, as now-amended, of the present invention, in contrast, provides a routing determiner, or corresponding operation, that determines such routings to obviate the need of the mobile telephone from registering when positioned in a new network.

The applicant further notes that paragraph 38 of De Beer further states that five choices of local networks are contained at the routing table 13 of the mobile telephone. And, this paragraph further states that the routing table comprises a number of sub-tables. However, here also, there is no disclosure, nor can any inference be derived, that structure or operation is disclosed which corresponds with the structure or methodology recited in the independent claims, as now-amended. And, figures 6 and 7 of De Beer, describing registration and routing table updating, disclose such structure or methodology.

Lannen also fails to disclose such structure or operation. Instead, Lannen, appears to be directed towards roaming operations of a subscriber. While the reference discloses a general location register that contains a data base for validating and locating roamers and a data base of routing information for location of home carriers. There does not appear to be any disclosure in this reference of a routing determiner that determines routings by which to communicate data by way of any of at least two networks, free of additional registration.

Similarly, Bergenwall also fails to disclose such structure or method, recited as now-amended. While the disclosure provides for re-registration of a mobile node, by foreign agent or an intermediate entity, the structure and operation is different than the routing determiner, and corresponding operation, recited in the claims, as now-amended. The present invention operates

free of additional registration, whereas Bergenwall merely provides for re-registration by a device other than a mobile node.

Because the dependent claims include all of the limitations of their respective parent claims, these claims are believed to be distinguishable over the cited references for the same reasons as those given with respect to their respective parent claims.

Claims 5 and 13 have been further amended to overcome the section 112 rejections thereof, and claims 11 and 18 have been amended in manners to overcome the objections thereto.

In light of the foregoing, therefore, independent claims 1 and 15, as now-amended, and the dependent claims dependent thereon are believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reexamination and reconsideration for allowance of the claims is respectfully requested. Such early action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert H. Kelly/

Robert H. Kelly
Registration No. 33,922

SCHEEF & STONE, L.L.P.
5956 Sherry Lane, Suite 1400
Dallas, Texas 75225
Telephone: (214) 706-4201
Fax: (214) 706-4242
robert.kelly@scheefandstone.com